

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DANTE B. FASCELL—NORTH-SOUTH
CENTER ACT OF 1991

SPEECH OF

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 12, 1998

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4757, which would designate the North/South Center at the University of Miami as the Dante B. Fascell North/South Center.

I thank Chairman GILMAN for his initiative in this matter, for it is a fitting honor for a truly great man.

For 36 years, Dante Fascell served on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, eight years as full Committee Chairman. He devoted his whole lifetime to the service of this nation and the nations of the world. A man with great insight, judgment, and knowledge, he was an advisor to Presidents who was also sought out by foreign leaders and dignitaries.

Throughout his decades of service, Mr. Fascell became more and more convinced of the need for an American foreign policy based on cultural, educational, trade and person-to-person exchanges between nations, in addition to normal government-to-government contacts. His vision became reality at his alma mater, the University of Miami. Dante Fascell is recognized as the father of the North/South Center, which today is Congressionally-authorized and one of the nation's leading institutions focusing on improving relations between the countries of North and South America and the Caribbean.

Despite his great achievements, however, Dante Fascell never forgot his roots. He was always friendly, open and approachable to his constituents in South Florida. He committed his efforts to solving little problems, as well as big ones. His common sense and common touch endeared him to—literally—generations of voters. It is not an exaggeration to say that, by the end of his service in Congress he was, as he is today, truly a legend in Florida.

Mr. Fascell retired from the Congress the year that I was elected, in 1992, and so I never had the honor of serving with him. But I have known him for many years. He set a very high standard for public service which all of us who follow him try daily to meet. And I am completely confident that those of you here today who served with Dante Fascell will agree with me that he is one of the finest men to serve in this body.

I would like to share with my colleagues a few comments on Dante Fascell which appeared in a Miami Herald editorial on his retirement.

[From the Miami Herald, May 28, 1992]

Dante Fascell retiring? Say it isn't so! But it is: Yesterday the veteran South Dade congressman announced in Washington that he won't seek a 20th term on Capitol Hill. Neither will he convert to his personal use, though legally he could, the \$500,000 or so in

his campaign treasury. That's fully consistent with his integrity, public and private.

Representative Fascell is a close second in seniority, but a clear first in esteem, among the members of Florida's congressional delegation. He has served with distinction as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Never was his wisdom on better display than during 1990's congressional debate of America's role in the Persian Gulf. His reasoned support for deploying multinational forces against Saddam Hussein was pivotal to winning House approval of President Bush's policies.

Yet Mr. Fascell, 75, also knows full well that violence rarely resolves international disputes. Long before Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, for instance, he had built a solid record of support for negotiations to bring peace to the Mideast while ensuring Israel's security. He also played a key role in congressional efforts to end violence and injustice in Central America and to restore democracy and human rights in Cuba, Haiti, Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Chile.

Less visible but arguably as important was Mr. Fascell's work in concert with leading European parliamentarians on behalf of human rights behind the Iron Curtain. Their efforts to free dissidents and goad the Eastern bloc to honor the Helsinki accords may well have helped hasten tyranny's demise and the Cold War's end. . . .

Among Mr. Fascell's endearing traits is one all too rare among elected officials: candor. He still has a way of cutting through baloney to get to the point. You can believe what he says.

You can also believe, however, that Mr. Fascell might leave some things unsaid in deference to his longtime colleagues and to an institution that he loves. Some retiring congressmen have spoken bitterly of their disillusionment with politics and of the 'poisonous atmosphere' pervading Capitol Hill. Mr. Fascell said that it was simply time to go after nearly 38 years of service.

Even so, there's cause for concern over Mr. Fascell's departure. Granted, many term-limits advocates would argue that he had already stayed on too long. It ought to be worrisome, though, when able public servants no longer feel that serving in Congress is rewarding enough or enjoyable enough to make them want to stick around.

For the nation and for Florida, then, Mr. Fascell's retirement is a loss. Beyond that, though, the obvious erosion in public service's attractiveness to candidates of his stature is an even greater loss.

H.R. 4519

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1998

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under the rules, H.R. 4519 is considered a private bill. However, because of their wide constituent interest, the following Members of Congress would like to be shown as supporters of H.R. 4519.

1. JIM MCGOVERN

2. BOB LIVINGSTON
3. WILLIAM JEFFERSON
4. ALLEN BOYD
5. GENE GREEN
6. JOHN OLVER
7. CARLOS ROMERO-BARCELÓ
8. VIRGIL GOODE
9. BOB STUMP
10. PHIL ENGLISH
11. GERALD SOLOMON
12. LINDA SMITH
13. JIM GIBBONS
14. SUE KELLY
15. JOHN TIERNEY
16. LYNN RIVERS
17. NANCY PELOSI
18. TOM PETRI
19. MICHAEL PAPPAS
20. DAVID HOBSON
21. DAVID OBEY
22. RICHARD BURR
23. CLAY SHAW
24. JAY JOHNSON
25. MARCY KAPTUR
26. BUD CRAMER

A DIFFICULT TASK

HON. MARSHALL "MARK" SANFORD

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1998

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, over the past few months, I have heard from literally thousands of folks back home on the President's matter. On Thursday, I had to digest all that I had heard, read and thought about this, and simply vote yes, or no, on whether or not to authorize the Judiciary Committee to proceed with an inquiry of impeachment. I voted yes and owe you an explanation of how I got there.

I agree with opponents of the process who have suggested there has been far too much grandstanding and moralizing on this issue. Frustration with politicians grandstanding, however, never moved me into the camp that believed we needed to quickly move on to "the nation's business." In fact, since this story broke in January, I have tried to listen carefully and in no way have forgotten about issues like Social Security or national security. However, I have come to believe that in the long-run, the current debate is probably just as relevant to the lives of Americans. Here is the reasoning that brought me to this conclusion.

At the core, representative government is built on trust. Thus, maintaining trust in the leaders who run the many components of government is every bit as important as the individual functions of government. In other words, "national security", or "moving onto the nation's business," without trust in the people running it is an oxymoron.

In our system of representative government, every free citizen has ceded over to our school board member, our county council member, our Senator and our President a little

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.